

California Environmental Quality Act

Initial Study

(as required by Sec. 15063 of the Public Resources Code)

To be completed by the lead agency

1. **Project Title:** Project No. No. 12-0000482
Comprehensive Update to the Zoning Use List
(Zone Text Amendment)
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Burbank
150 North Third Street
Burbank, CA 91502
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Martin Potter, Planning Technician
818-238-5250
4. **Project Location:** The proposed zone text amendment would affect all properties zoned for commercial and industrial use located throughout Burbank.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** City of Burbank
150 North Third Street,
Burbank, California 91502
6. **General Plan Designation:** All of the properties affected by the Zone Text Amendment are designated for commercial or industrial use in the General Plan Land Use Element
7. **Zoning:** The project affects all commercial and industrial zones in Burbank. No residential zones would be affected as part of this project.
8. **Description of Project:**
The Zoning Use List is a matrix of uses that are allowed in all commercial and industrial zones throughout Burbank, and what permits they may require, if any. The project would consolidate some of the existing uses on the Zoning Use List into new uses. In some cases, uses would now be permitted by right in zones where they previously required a Conditional Use Permit or were not permitted. In other cases, some uses would be prohibited in zones that they are currently permitted in. All of the proposed changes are consistent with the intent of each zone as well as the City's General Plan.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:**
The proposed project affects all commercial and industrial land uses in Burbank, which is an urbanized city. Any development occurring pursuant to the proposed Zone Text Amendment would be in-fill development on previously developed properties. No residentially zoned properties would be affected.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology /Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise
<input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☒ I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Patrick Prescott
Printed name

Date

City of Burbank
For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

<u>I. AESTHETICS</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) Burbank does not currently have an adopted definition of scenic vista, or a map designating local scenic views. Scenic vistas in Burbank could include views of the Verdugo Mountains to the northeast and views of the eastern Santa Monica Mountains to the west. The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any scenic vistas or result in damage to scenic resources. (3)

c) The proposed project would not result in a degradation of the visual character of the city. The proposed project regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted throughout the city. Any development occurring pursuant to the proposed project may be required to comply with existing development standards which are intended to preserve visual character. (1)

d) The proposed project regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted. The proposed project would not alter existing height limits or cause construction to occur that would create new sources of light or glare. (3)

<u>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES:</u> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the CA Agricultural Land Evaluation & Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the CA Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the CA Dept. of Forestry & Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest & Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the ARB. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

a-e) Burbank is an urbanized city and does not contain farmland resources or properties zoned for agricultural use. According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), there is no Important Farmland located in Burbank. No federal plans, policies, regulations, or laws related to agricultural resources apply and no property is under a Williamson Act contract. (3,6,7)

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

e) Create objectionable odors affecting substantial # of people?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

a-d) Approving the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) Plan to manage air quality or cause air quality standards to be violated (or further a violation). No criteria air pollutants in the South Coast Basin would experience a cumulative considerable net increase. The proposed project only regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted, and residential zones are affected as part of the project.

e) The proposed project only regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted and would not create objectionable odors.

<u>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-d) No special status or sensitive animals or plants are identified by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife are known to exist within the proposed project area, which is considered an urbanized region. In addition, no riparian or wetland habitats exist in the proposed project area. (3)

e-f) The City of Burbank has not adopted any Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. (13)

<u>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) The proposed project affects all commercial and industrial zones. Some historic or potentially historic structures may be located in the proposed project area. However, the proposed project is only regulating the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted throughout the city and would not necessarily cause development to occur, nor cause an adverse change in the significance of any historic or potentially historic resource.

b-d) There are no known sites or areas in the proposed project area with archeological or paleontological resources, nor are there any known or expected human remains in the proposed project area.

<u>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-e) The proposed project area is not on a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zone or any known active faults. According to the California Geological Survey Seismic Hazard Zones map, a majority of the proposed project area is located in a liquefaction zone; however, no known liquefaction has

occurred as a result of an earthquake or seismic ground-shaking. The California Division of Mines and Geology “Quaternary Geology of the San Fernando Valley” map shows that the soil in Burbank consists primarily of alluvial fan deposits (Qyf2) with loose to moderately dense sand and minor amounts of clay as well as some active wash deposits (Qw) with loose to moderately dense sand and silty sand, and indicates a concealed fault (the Verdugo Fault) running along the base of the Verdugo mountains. The Verdugo Fault is not recognized as an active fault by the California Geological Survey. (11, 14)

<u>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) The proposed project regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted in Burbank, which is an urbanized area. The proposed project would not cause development to occur that would generate greenhouse gas emissions (GHGe) having a significant impact. The proposed project would not be in conflict with AB 32, the state policy adopted to reduce GHGe or the City’s Sustainability Action Plan.

<u>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-d) The proposed project regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted in the city and would not result in the release of hazardous materials or other hazardous conditions. There are no changes proposed for sites listed on the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List.

e-f) Commercial and industrial sites affected by the proposed project are located within two miles of the Bob Hope Airport. The proposed project would not cause development to occur and does not create any new additional safety hazards for people in the area. The proposed project does not modify height limitations or conflict with airport operations.

g-h) The proposed project will not impair or interfere with any emergency action or evacuation plan adopted by the City of Burbank. The proposed project regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted and would not expose people or structures to wildfire risk and would not expose people or structures to wildfire risk.

<u>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-f) The proposed project would not exempt future developments from complying with Burbank Municipal Code requirements for drainage and surface runoff concerns, including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) which will maintain the existing water quality of the area. The proposed project area is urbanized and entirely built-out; the proposed project would not alter any stream or river or substantially alter the existing drainage pattern. (18)

Commercial and industrial sites affected by the proposed project are located within two miles of the Bob Hope Airport. The proposed project would not cause development to occur and does not create any new additional safety hazards for people in the area.

g-j) The proposed project regulates the manner in which uses are permitted in commercial and industrial zones. The proposed project would not cause development to occur on commercial and/or industrial properties within 100-year floodplain or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss as a result of flooding or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

<u>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-c) The proposed project regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted and would not physically divide an established community. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect or any habitat conservation plan or natural conservation plan (there are none applicable to the proposed project area). The proposed project would remedy inconsistencies

between the Zoning Use List and other sections of the Zoning Ordinance, specific plans, and the General Plan.

<u>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES</u> -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource. The Mineral Land Classification Map identifies zones MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 as occurring in the City of Burbank. The City of Burbank does not designate any lands as being appropriate for mining uses. Mining activities within the city have not been identified as a value to residents of the state and this project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site as there are none existing in this proposed project area. (14)

<u>XII. NOISE</u> – Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-d) The proposed project only regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted in the city and would not cause development to occur. The proposed project would not

expose people to excessive noise levels and would not exempt future development from complying with noise standards established in the General Plan Noise Element and Noise Ordinance.

e-f) Any development occurring pursuant to the proposed project within 2 miles of the Bob Hope Airport would be subject to standards established in the City of Burbank's Noise Ordinance, and thus would not expose employees or persons residing in the adjacent area to excessive noise. There are no private airstrips in the City of Burbank.

<u>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-c) The proposed project regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted throughout the city. The proposed project would not result in a significant increase in population in the area. The proposed project would not affect residential zones or uses within those zones, and would not displace a substantial number of housing or persons.

<u>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) The proposed project only regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial properties are permitted, including public and semi-public facilities, and would not cause development to occur.

The proposed project would not involve or require the provision of a new or physically altered government facility in order to maintain acceptable levels of response, service, or performance.

<u>XV. RECREATION</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) The proposed project regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted and would not increase the use of any existing recreational facilities. The project does not contain any residential or other uses that would generate recreational demands and would not require the construction of additional recreational facilities.

<u>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u> -- Would the proposed project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system. Including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-f) The proposed project regulates the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted by consolidating uses that have similar land use and transportation impacts or combines uses, that are not frequent in the community, that have negligible variations in their traffic impacts. Many uses in the Zoning Use List are not specified in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation handbook; the proposed project would consolidate such uses into more general use categories that have classifications in the ITE handbook, where appropriate. In some cases, uses would now be permitted by right in zones where they previously required a Conditional Use Permit or were not allowed. In other cases, some uses would be prohibited in zones that they are currently permitted in. However, the proposed project itself does not cause development to occur. The proposed project would not cause a change in air traffic patterns, substantially increase hazards due of a design feature, result in inadequate emergency access, or conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs. (2, 11)

<u>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u> – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-g) The proposed project is not a physical development; it is only regulating the manner in which commercial and industrial uses are permitted and would not cause development to occur. The proposed project and would not result in the construction of new wastewater or storm water facilities and would not exempt future developments from complying with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

<u>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) The proposed project area is located within a completely urbanized area. There are no significant natural habitats or known historical/prehistoric artifacts on site.

b-c) The proposed project would not result in any foreseeable cumulatively considerable impacts. The proposed project would not create any nuisances or other environmental effects that would result in adverse health effects on the population.

ATTACHMENT A

COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO THE ZONING USE LIST BIBLIOGRAPHY

Materials listed in this bibliography are available for review at the City of Burbank Planning Division Public Counter.

1. Project Description
2. City of Burbank, "Burbank Municipal Code," Title 10, Zoning, Burbank, California
3. City of Burbank "Zoning Map," Burbank, California
4. City of Burbank, Community Development Department, "Land Use Element of the City of Burbank General Plan," Burbank, California, adopted by Burbank City Council on May 31, 1988, Resolution No. 22,354
5. Envicom Corporation, "Land Use Element EIR," Prepared for the City of Burbank Community Development Department, February 1988.
6. Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation, Eighth Edition, 2008
7. City of Burbank, Community Development Department, "Safety Element of the City of Burbank General Plan," Burbank, California, adopted by Burbank City Council on July 1, 1997, Resolution No. 25,087
8. City of Burbank, Community Development Department, "Transportation Element of the City of Burbank General Plan," Burbank, California, adopted by Burbank City Council in 1964
9. South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Handbook, April 1993
10. City of Burbank, Community Development Department, "Open Space/Conservation Element of the City of Burbank General Plan," Burbank, California, adopted by Burbank City Council on December 19, 1972, Resolution No. 16,280
11. Mineral Land and Classification Map - California Division of Mines and Geology, May 25, 1979
12. Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel Number 065018 0005 C January 20, 1999
13. City of Burbank, Community Development Department, "Noise Element of the City of Burbank General Plan," Burbank, California, adopted by Burbank City Council on December 8, 1992, Resolution No. 23,777

14. Hitchcock, C.S. and Wills, C.J., 2000, Quaternary Geology of the San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles County, California: California Division of Mines and Geology, Map Sheet MS 50, scale 1:48000.